

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed July 5, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 10-19, 27-33, 42-49, and 57-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter, since the claims do not recited a limitation of a tangible medium. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-19, 27-33, 42-49, and 57-58, as presented, are directed to statutory subject matter. For example, *The Examination Guidelines for Computer-Related Inventions* ("Guidelines") sets forth the official examination policies promulgated by the USPTO. See Federal Register: February 28, 1996 (Volume 61, Number 40), Page 7478-7492. In the Training Materials made available by the USPTO to teach examiners how to apply these Guidelines, the Training Materials include, as an example, a propagated signal claim in the form of a "computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave," that is described as "a statutory article of manufacture claim," although it is not a tangible medium. See pages 39-40 and 45 of the Training Materials (located at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/pdf/compenex.pdf>). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-19, 27-33, 42-49, and 57-58 are in accordance with USPTO policy and are directed to statutory subject matter for at least this reason.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 2-7 and 10-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *LeMole* (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,410). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding claims 2-7, Applicants submit that *LeMole* does not teach or suggest a method or system directed to "getting a direct or indirect reference to a destination based on user information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store; and causing the browser to browse to that destination wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the destination reference," as recited in independent claim 4.

Rather, *LeMole* discloses that a user enters a URL to retrieve a dynamic web page from a CAR server, where content of the dynamic web page is customized in accordance with the user's interests. *See* col. 2, lines 4-55. For example, *LeMole* states:

a request is made through the user's browser for the individualized personal advertising page by entering the URL address of the HTTP server, manually or through a bookmark, or by clicking on a special icon button on the browser. . . . the browser forwards the user's requests to the HTTP server. . . . the HTTP server forwards the request to the CAR server. . . . the CAR server consults its associated database for the profile record associated with the user and, based on the stored profile, dynamically produces a personalized composite advertising page for the user. . . . the composite advertising page is returned to the user's browser.

Col. 6, lines 51-63.

Therefore, *LeMole* fails to teach or suggest "getting a direct or indirect reference to a destination based on user information in a user profile," since it apparently discloses that a user profile contains areas of interests and demographic data and not references to destinations. *See* FIG. 2. Further, *LeMole* fails to teach or suggest "a user profile [being] accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store," since

LeMole seemingly teaches that a browser implements the URL for the CAR server, where the CAR server accesses a user profile of demographic data. Also, *LeMole* fails to teach or suggest "causing the browser to browse to that destination wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the destination reference," since *LeMole* seemingly teaches that the browser is directed to content from the CAR server 111 until a user decides to view another web page at another network location. In particular, *LeMole* states that "the user decides whether to view another ad [at the advertiser's own Web site]. If yes . . . the browser is backed up to the composite page. . . . If the user . . . does not want to view another ad from the composite page, he or she returns to the work context by entering the URL address to the next site he or she wants to access." Cols. 6-7, lines 66-5. Thus, *LeMole* does not teach or suggest the respective feature.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, *LeMole* fails to disclose all of the features of claim 4. Accordingly, claim 4 and claims 2-3 & 5-7 (which depend from claim 4) are allowable over *LeMole*.

Regarding claims 10-16, Applicants submit that *LeMole* fails to teach or suggest a "destination method that may be called by web content to get a direct or indirect reference to a destination based on user information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store and cause a browser to browse to that destination, wherein the destination method accesses a user profile to obtain the destination reference," as featured in claim 13, for at least the reasons previously discussed. Therefore, *LeMole* fails to disclose all of the features of claim 13. Accordingly, claim 13 and claims 10-12 and 14-16 (which depend from claim 13) are allowable over *LeMole*, for at least that reason.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

a. Claim 8

Claims 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *LeMole* in view of *Burke* (U.S. Patent No. 6,032,162). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants submits that *LeMole* does not teach or suggest all of the claimed features of independent claim 4, as previously discussed. Notably, *Burke* similarly does not teach all of the claimed features of independent claim 4. Further, *Burke* does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 8. For example, *Burke* seemingly discloses that "a more complex access procedure may be used when a User . . . is behind a security firewall," and as such, does not teach or suggest "displaying a different one of the selectable designators based on whether the user is inside or outside of a firewall," as recited in claim 8. *See* col. 3, lines 31-35. Thus, claim 8 is allowable over the proposed combination of *LeMole* in view of *Burke* for at least these reasons.

b. Claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-33, 35-39, 42-48, 51-54, and 57-58

Claims 17-18, 21-24, 27-33, 35-39, 42-48, 51-54, and 57-58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *LeMole* in view of *Roosen* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0036793). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding claims 17-18, Applicants submits that *LeMole* does not teach or suggests all of the claimed features of independent claim 13, as previously discussed. Notably, *Roosen* similarly does not teach all of the claimed features of independent claim 13. Further, *Roosen* does not teach or suggest the all the features of claims 17-18. Thus, claims 17-18 are allowable over the proposed combination of *LeMole* in view of *Roosen* for at least these reasons.

Regarding claims 21-24, Applicants submits that *LeMole* does not teach or suggests all of the claimed features of independent claim 22, such as the steps of "getting a direct or indirect reference to a printer list destination based on user information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store; and causing the browser to browse to the printer list destination, wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the printer list destination reference," for at least the reasons previously discussed. Similarly, *Roosen* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of the *LeMole*. Thus, claim 22 and claims 21 & 23-24 (which depend from claim 22) are allowable over the proposed combination of *LeMole* in view of *Roosen* for at least these reasons.

Regarding claims 27-33, Applicants submits that *LeMole* does not teach or suggests all of the claimed features of independent claim 30, such as "a printer list destination method that may be called to get a direct or indirect reference to a printer list destination based on user information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store and cause a browser to browse to that reference destination, wherein the printer list destination method accesses a user profile to obtain the printer list destination reference," for at least the reasons previously discussed. Similarly, *Roosen* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of the *LeMole*. Thus, claim 30 and claims 27-29 & 31-33 (which depend from claim 30) are allowable over the proposed combination of *LeMole* in view of *Roosen* for at least these reasons.

Regarding claims 35-39, Applicants submits that *LeMole* does not teach or suggests all of the claimed features of independent claim 37, such as the step of "causing the browser to browse to the printer destination, wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the printer destination reference," for at least the reasons previously discussed. Similarly, *Roosen* is

inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of the *LeMole*. Thus, claim 37 and claims 35-36 & 38-39 (which depend from claim 37) are allowable over the proposed combination of *LeMole* in view of *Roosen* for at least these reasons.

Regarding claims 42-48, Applicants submits that *LeMole* does not teach or suggests all of the claimed features of independent claim 44, such as "a printer destination method that may be called to get a direct or indirect reference to a printer destination based on user information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store and cause a browser to browse to that URL destination, wherein the printer destination method accesses a user profile to obtain the printer destination reference," for at least the reasons previously discussed. Similarly, *Roosen* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of the *LeMole*. Thus, claim 44 and claims 42-43 & 45-48 (which depend from claim 44) are allowable over the proposed combination of *LeMole* in view of *Roosen* for at least these reasons.

Regarding claims 51-54, Applicants submits that *LeMole* does not teach or suggests all of the claimed features of independent claim 52, such as "causing the browser to browse to the printnow destination, wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the printnow destination reference," for at least the reasons previously discussed. Similarly, *Roosen* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of the *LeMole*. Thus, claim 52 and claims 51 & 53-54 (which depend from claim 52) are allowable over the proposed combination of *LeMole* in view of *Roosen* for at least these reasons.

Regarding claims 57-59, Applicants submits that *LeMole* does not teach or suggests all of the claimed features of independent claim 57, such as "a print now destination method that may be called to get a direct or indirect reference to a PRINTNOW destination that will print using preset printer settings based on user

information in a user profile accessed via a networked autonomous user profile store, and cause a browser to browse to that URL destination, wherein the preset printer settings at the PRINTNOW destination are associated with identification information from a user profile," for at least the reasons previously discussed. Similarly, *Roosen* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of the *LeMole*. Thus, claim 57 and claim 58 (which depends from claim 57) are allowable over the proposed combination of *LeMole* in view of *Roosen* for at least these reasons.

c. Claims 19, 25, 40, 49, and 55

Claims 19, 25, 40, 49, and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *LeMole* in view of *Roosen* in further view of *Burke*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dependent claims 19, 25, 40, 49, and 55 (which depend from respective independent claims 13, 22, 37, 44, and 52 that are allowable over the cited art) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the above-identified dependent claims contain all features/elements/steps of their respective base independent claims and the additional art in the proposed combination is legally inadequate to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference(s) that were applied against the respective independent claims. Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles W. Griggers
Registration No. 47,283